

### REMARKS

Claims 1-77 are pending in this application, with claims 1 and 38 being independent. Claims 40, 59 and 66 have been amended to correct minor errors in view of the rejections under section 112, second paragraph. No new matter has been introduced.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 8-15, 17-26, 29-36, 47, 48, 50-58, 66, 67 and 69-77 are directed to allowable subject matter.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under section 112, second paragraph, are requested in view of the amendments to claims 40, 59 and 66. These amendments are believed to address all of the Examiner's concerns.

Claims 1-6, 16, 27, 28, 37-42, 44, 59, 60, 62 and 63 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Griffin (U.S. Patent No. 5,701,390) in view of Barnwell.

With respect to claim 1, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Griffin, Barnwell, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests computing first and second digital filters having frequency responses corresponding to spectral information in frequency regions where the voicing state equals a selected voicing state, determining a set of pulse locations, producing sets of first and second signal samples using the digital filters and the pulse locations, and combining the first and second signal samples to produce digital speech samples, as recited in claim 1.

Recognizing that Griffin does not describe or suggest determining a set of pulse locations, producing sets of first and second signal samples using the digital filters and the pulse locations, and combining the first and second signal samples to produce digital speech samples, the rejection asserts that doing so was well known, as evidenced by Barnwell. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In particular, the passage of Barnwell identified in the rejection (pages 85-89) merely describes well known linear predictive coding techniques and in no way describes or suggests the recited producing of sets of first and second signal samples using the digital filters and the pulse locations, or the recited combining of the first and second signal samples to

produce digital speech samples. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims should be withdrawn.

Similarly to claim 1, independent claim 38 recites, among other elements, computing first and second impulse responses for a selected voicing state from decoded speech model parameters for a subframe and a previous subframe, computing a set of pulse locations for the subframe, producing sets of first and second signal samples from the first and second impulse responses and the pulse locations, and combining the first and second signal samples to produce digital speech samples for the subframe. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 38 and its dependent claims for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 7, 42, 45, 46, 49, 61, 64, 65 and 68 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Griffin in view of Barnwell and allegedly well known prior art. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because the allegedly well known prior art does not remedy the failure of Griffin and Barnwell to describe or suggest the subject matter of independent claims 1 and 38.


Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

The two-month Petition for Extension of Time fee in the amount of \$450 is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06 1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

2/21/06

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John F. Hayden  
Reg. No. 37,640

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331  
40316683.doc